



IFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of : **Confirmation No. 1359**  
Kazuhiko KOSUGE et al. : Attorney Docket No. 2004\_1271A  
Serial No. 10/509,080 : Group Art Unit 1712  
Filed December 1, 2004 : Examiner Margaret G. Moore  
COMPOSITE COMPRISING : **Mail Stop Amendment**  
HEAT-RESISTANT FIBER AND  
SILOXANE POLYMER

**SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED  
TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE  
FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT  
ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

Sir:

The following remarks are in addition to the remarks set forth in the Amendment filed April 28, 2006.

Enclosed with the Amendment filed April 28, 2006 was a Declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.132. This Declaration compares samples created using the fibers of EP '633 and EP '383 with samples created using polyparaphenylene terephthalamide fiber, as recited in Applicants' amended claim 5. The Declaration demonstrates that the samples created using polyparaphenylene terephthalamide fiber are unexpectedly superior in cut resistance and cut resistance increase ratios to samples created using the fibers of EP '633 and EP '383. Therefore, it is clear that the polyparaphenylene terephthalamide fiber of Applicants' claims is not an equivalent to the fibers of EP '633 or EP '383, and therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not substitute Applicants' recited fiber for the fibers of the cited references. Applicants present these arguments to demonstrate that the claimed invention is neither anticipated by, nor rendered obvious by EP '633 or EP '383.

Furthermore, Applicants' claims are patentable over the teachings of Naito et al. because Naito et al. fail to teach or suggest polyparaphenylene terephthalamide fiber, and

because Naito et al. require a cross-linking agent, which has been excluded from Applicants' claims.

Applicants' claims are patentable over Stengle, because Stengle does not teach Applicants' recited metal catalyst. Further, Applicants' claims are patentable over Stengle in view of Jasinski et al., because Jasinski et al. fail to teach or suggest a catalyst selected from the group recited in Applicants' amended claims.

In view of the amendments and remarks filed April 28, 2006, as well as the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Kazuhiko KOSUGE et al.

By: Warren M. Cheek, Jr.  
Warren M. Cheek, Jr.  
Registration No. 33,367  
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/AEP/nrj  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021  
Telephone (202) 721-8200  
Facsimile (202) 721-8250  
May 18, 2006